

The fact is that we simply do not have the political will to establish the common good. If our costs were in line with other industrialized nations who have a national health care system, government spending in this country alone would cover our costs. I can hear the chorus already. Do not let anyone tell you that health care in England or Germany or Sweden or Norway or France or Japan is not as good as ours. Ours is good if you are lucky with the right piece of plastic in your pocket when you get sick. But if you do not have insurance, it is a real crapshoot. It is a real roll of the dice.

Americans deserve universal health care, just like everybody else from the industrialized nations, all of the way to Iraq. Yes, most people would actually save money, according to the Congressional Budget Office, because if we tightened up the system and got rid of the millions of forms, the hundred billion dollars' worth of paper that we put in every year, we would have a cheaper system than we presently do with guaranteed benefits and guaranteed revenue.

The President has said, "These problems will not be solved with a nationalized health care system that dictates coverage and rations care." He said it right here in the well. Every health insurer in the United States dictates coverage. That is how they do business, and America is rationing care. The time has come to change that. We will talk more about that later.

We need a solution.

I have introduced H.R. 1200, the American Health Security Act. I also support other plans to reform our health care system.

Reform will not change how health care is delivered, only how it's paid for.

Health care providers will continue to do business as they already do, competing with one another, striving to be the best.

Under my plan people can choose their doctor and hospital, an incentive for innovation and a reward for excellence.

For health care providers, national health insurance means a guaranteed revenue stream.

For Americans, national health insurance means coverage for everyone.

America was founded on the premise of working together for the common good. Our society recognizes this responsibility every time a fire truck responds to a fire or a police car responds to a call for help.

Today, there is an urgent call for help from voices across America.

We have it in our power to respond. Come on Mr. President. We are already paying for universal health care. Let us make sure Americans get it.

WAR ON TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, today I want to spend a little bit of time talking about the war on terrorism,

and I believe it is a war, tracing the history of the previous administrations and the Bush administration in recognizing the threat that al Qaeda, Iraq, and others pose to the United States as evidenced most dramatically on the events of September 11, 2001.

Back in February 1998, then-President Clinton talked about the threat of Iraq: "They have harassed the inspectors, lied to them, disabled monitoring cameras, literally spirited evidence out of the back doors."

Another quote: "They," predators of the 21st century, "will be all the more lethal if we allow them to build arsenals of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and the missiles to deliver them. We simply cannot allow that to happen. There should be no doubt, Saddam's ability to produce and deliver weapons of mass destruction poses a grave threat to the peace of that region and the security of the world. There is no more clear example of this threat than Saddam Hussein's Iraq. His regime threatens the safety of the people, the stability of his region, and the security of all the rest of us. In the next century, the community of nations may see more and more of the very kind of threat Iraq poses, a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them, to provide them to terrorists who travel the world. If we fail to respond today, Saddam Hussein will be emboldened tomorrow by the knowledge that they can act with impunity."

Another quote from President Clinton in 1998: "I have no doubt he would use them again if permitted to develop them."

So back in 1998, President Clinton was highlighting the threat as he saw it, in this case talking about Iraq specifically, but also laying out the possibility of what might happen in the future. Again the quote: "A rogue state with weapons of mass destruction, ready to use them or provide them to terrorists."

On September 11, 2001, we found out in the United States about the willingness of terrorist organizations to use airplanes as a weapon of mass destruction and to inflict death and destruction to an extent we had never seen before.

Another quote, and this is from President Clinton, I believe: "Some day, some way, I guarantee you he will use the arsenal; and I think everyone of you who has worked on this for any length of time believes that, too." Again, not President Bush in 2001, 2002 or 2003, but a consistent message beginning in the late 1990s from President Clinton and his administration outlining the threat of Iraq; and, more importantly, the threat of a linkage of the capabilities that Iraq might have and their willingness to give those capabilities and share them with terrorist organizations.

Again, the same speech: "Saddam Hussein's Iraq reminds us of what we learned in the 20th century and warns

us what we must know about the 21st century. In this century, we learned through harsh experience that the only answer to aggression and illegal behavior is firmness, determination and, when necessary, action. In the next century, the community of nations may see more and more the very kind of threat Iraq poses now, a rogue state with weapons of mass destruction ready to use them or provide them to terrorists, drug traffickers or organized criminals who travel the world among us unnoticed."

Through the window of 9/11, we can see how prophetic President Clinton was in 1998. Let me read that again: "In this century, we learned through harsh experience that the only answer to aggression and illegal behavior is firmness, determination and, when necessary, action. In the next century, the community of nations may see more and more the very kind of threat Iraq poses now," or paraphrasing, that I believe terrorist organizations will pose in the 21st century.

December 17, 1998, President Clinton said: "I am convinced that the decision I made to order this military action, though difficult, was absolutely the right thing to do. It is in our interest and in the interest of the people around the world. Saddam Hussein has used weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles before. I have no doubt he would use them again if permitted to develop them."

So back in the 1990s, the late 1990s, President Clinton was highlighting the threat of Iraq and also outlining the threats of terrorist organizations in the 21st century.

Another quote, and this is from the White House, a White House briefing. It is a speech by Senator Al Gore. This is way back in 1992. So even in the early 1990s, key officials in what would become the Clinton administration had identified the challenges that we would face as a Nation in the 21st century. Here is what Senator Al Gore said: "He had already launched poison gas attacks repeatedly," and this is what he says about the President at that time, "and Bush looked the other way. He had already conducted extensive terrorist activities, and Bush looked the other way. He was already deeply involved in the effort to acquire nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, and Bush knew it, but he looked the other way."

Then Senator Al Gore in 1992 said: "Well, in my view, the Bush administration was acting in a manner directly opposite to what you would expect. With all of the evidence that it had available to it at the time, Saddam Hussein's nature and intentions were perfectly visible."

In other remarks made by Vice President Al Gore, May 23, 2000, talking about the threat of Saddam Hussein: "Despite our swift victory in every sense, there is no doubt in my mind that Saddam Hussein still seeks to amass weapons of mass destruction.

You know as well as I do that as long as Saddam Hussein stays in power, there can be no comprehensive peace for the people of Israel or the people of the Middle East. We have made it clear," and this is Vice President Al Gore on May 23, 2000, "we have made it clear that it is our policy to see Saddam Hussein gone." In parentheses, applause. "We have sought coalitions of opponents to challenge his power. I have met with the Iraqi opposition, and invite them to meet with me again next month when I will encourage them to further unite in their efforts against Saddam."

The threat to peace in the civilized world was well identified through the Clinton administration through the 1990s.

Here is another article talking about folks and their views of Saddam Hussein dated November 1997: "The stakes are very real, and they are enormous," said Richard Haass, Middle East expert on the National Security Council during the Bush administration. "This is someone who has used weapons of mass destruction twice against his own people and against Iran. He does not have qualms. Based on U.N. inspection reports and Western intelligence assessments, Washington's allies are convinced that Saddam Hussein possesses the resources and technical skill to begin cranking out menacing new supplies of exotic weaponry and delivery systems with even a brief absence of foreign watch dogs."

That is the same thing that David Kay said when he came back, saying at this point in time the Iraqi survey group may not have found stockpiled weapons of mass destruction, and David Kay believes that maybe they did not exist after meeting with the new folks over there. He said we may or may not find the stockpiles, but the key thing here, and this is what David Kay said, which was reported already in 1997: "Washington and its allies are convinced that Hussein possesses the resources and technical skill to begin cranking out menacing new supplies of exotic weaponry and delivery systems with even a brief absence of foreign watch dogs."

So the real question was after the war and after we went in and took a look at what they had, what did David Kay find? He found exactly what was identified in 1997, that if the stockpiles are not there, what Saddam Hussein has done is he has developed the capability, the weaponry, to crank out menacing new supplies during a brief absence of foreign watch dogs. The intent was clear. Saddam Hussein used weapons of mass destruction at one time, may have had stockpiles, but clearly was building the technical infrastructure to be able to produce significant quantities of weapons of mass destruction in a relatively short period of time once the inspectors were gone and once sanctions were lifted.

□ 1445

September 9, 1998, Madeleine Albright:

"In this struggle our adversaries are likely to avoid traditional battlefield situations because there American dominance is well established. We must be concerned instead by weapons of mass destruction and by the cowardly instruments of sabotage and hidden bombs. These unconventional threats endanger not only our Armed Forces but all Americans and America's friends everywhere. We must understand that this confrontation is long-term. It doesn't lend itself to a quick victory."

For those of us who believe that September 11 was the culmination of our war with al Qaeda and with terrorist organizations, listen to Madeleine Albright, 1998, who recognized that this war was already going on in the 1990s because of the length and the number of attacks that had taken place during the 1990s. Remember, early in the 1990s was the first time that the World Trade Center was hit, and she recognized in her quote: "We must understand that this confrontation is long-term. It doesn't lend itself to quick victory."

She goes on to say: "Force for peace, freedom, progress and law in the world. But no threat, no bomb, no terrorist can diminish America's determination to lead."

She then also goes on: "A second major threat to America's security also has entered a new phase and that is weapons of mass destruction and the systems that deliver them. For decades, we viewed this threat primarily through a narrow Cold War lens and now our concerns have broadened. We are deeply concerned by regional tensions in South Asia where both India and Pakistan have conducted nuclear tests."

Going on: "Chemical or biological warheads and they are devilishly difficult to shoot down."

So the threat of weapons of mass destruction was well understood during the Clinton administration by President Clinton, by Vice President Gore, by Senator Gore in 1992, by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright when we used force against Saddam in December of 1998. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright:

"This is a moment of grave determination. We have decided to use force because other means simply have not worked. Saddam's capacity to develop and brandish such armaments poses a threat to international security and peace that cannot be ignored. Month after month we have given Iraq chance after chance to move from confrontation to cooperation and we have explored and exhausted every diplomatic action. We will see now whether force can persuade Iraq's misguided leaders to reverse course and to accept at long last the need to abide by the rule of law and the will of the world."

October 16, 1998, National Security Adviser Samuel Berger, an op-ed piece in the Washington Times:

"Indeed we have information that Iraq has assisted in the chemical weapons activity in Sudan. We had information linking bin Laden to the Sudanese regime and the Al Shifa plant."

"One senior administration official, who asked not to be quoted by name, said the administration had compelling evidence tying Al Shifa to the Sudanese military and to Iraq's chemical weapons program, none of which have ties to bin Laden."

So there were questions about whether bin Laden was involved or not with the Al Shifa plant, but there was no question here back in 1998 by a number of folks within the Clinton administration that Iraq was involved with chemical weapons activity in Sudan.

A dangerous world. Why do I talk about the events of the 1990s up until 2000, the Clinton administration? It is because for a long time leaders in this country have been identifying Iraq and terrorism as the new threat to the security of America and Americans and the free world.

An interesting quote, Secretary Albright, Time Magazine, November 23, 1998:

"Up to now, we've had diplomacy backed by force. Now we need to shift to force backed up by diplomacy." In that same article, she is quoted as saying: "We'll be prepared to act alone if we have to."

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright:

"Month after month we have given Iraq chance after chance to move from confrontation to cooperation. We have explored and exhausted every diplomatic action. We will see now whether force can persuade Iraq's misguided leaders to reverse course and to accept at long last the need to abide by the rule of law and the will of the world."

President Clinton in the State of the Union speech on January 20, 1999:

"For nearly a decade, Iraq has defied its obligation to destroy its weapons of terror and the missiles to deliver them. America will continue to contain Saddam, and we will work for the day when Iraq has a government worthy of its people." Remember that by that time, the policy of regime change for Iraq had already become the accepted policy of the United States and the accepted policy of the Clinton administration.

Why do we talk about it now? Because the threat in 2004 is still very, very real. But let us go back and document that what happened on 9/11 was not an isolated event. It was the most significant event of a series of attacks on U.S. interests.

In 1993 was when the World Trade Center was bombed for the first time. 1996 was when the U.S. military barracks were bombed in Saudi Arabia. In 2000 there was the attack on the USS *Cole*. Of course we also had the attacks on our embassies in Africa during the late 1990s. In 1995, two unidentified gunmen killed two U.S. diplomats and wounded a third in Karachi, Pakistan.

In 1997 a Palestinian sniper opened fire on tourists atop the Empire State Building. A bomb exploded across the street from the U.S. embassy in Manila, injuring nine people. The list goes on. What had happened during much of the 1990s, there was compelling evidence that there were individuals who had declared war on the United States, but we never recognized the threat in terms of the actions that we took.

I am sure that that will be a debate much like there is a debate as to whether going to war in Iraq was the appropriate activity. There should also be, and there will be, a debate as to whether doing very little during the 1990s was the appropriate action. But what we do have in the 1990s is a clear record of factual events that America was a target. We have the clear statements from a President, a Vice President, a National Security Adviser, a Secretary of State that identified the changing shifts and the challenges to the security of the United States, moving out of the Cold War mentality of the period from 1945 to the early 1990s to a new threat of rogue states, but also rogue organizations that were not tied to a single country but that were loose gatherings of individuals, scattered throughout parts of the world that in many cases were willing to operate on their own. They are still out there, and in many ways we have damaged their capabilities to effectively attack us; but they are still out there organizing, recruiting, raising funds and training with the hope and expectation that they will hit us and that they will hit others again in the future. Is that a new threat? Here is what we said about Iraq in 1999:

"Iraq continued to plan and sponsor international terrorism in 1999. Although Baghdad focused primarily on the anti-regime opposition both at home and abroad, it continued to provide safe haven and support to various terrorist organizations."

Going on, the "Global Terrorism Overview of State-Sponsored Terrorism" says:

"Iraq continued to provide safe haven to a variety of Palestinian rejectionist groups, including the Abu Nidal organization, the Arab Liberation Front, and the former head of the now defunct 15 May Organization, Abu Ibrahim, who masterminded several bombings of U.S. aircraft. Iraq provided bases, weapons and protections to the MEK, an Iranian terrorist group that opposes the current Iranian regime."

The "Pattern of Global Terrorism" report in 2001 said about Iraq:

"In addition, the regime continued to provide training and political encouragement to numerous terrorist groups, although its main focus was again on dissident Iraqi activity overseas. Iraq provided bases to several terrorist groups including the Mujahedin-e-Khalq (MEK), the Kurdistan Workers' Party, the Palestine Liberation Front, and the Abu Nidal organization. In 2001, the Popular Front for the Libera-

tion of Palestine raised its profile in the West Bank and Gaza Strip by carrying out successful terrorist attacks against Israeli targets. In recognition of the PFLP's growing role, an Iraqi vice president met with former PFLP Secretary General Habbash in Baghdad in January 2001 and expressed continued Iraq support for the intifada. Also in mid-September a senior delegation from the PFLP met with an Iraqi deputy prime minister. Baghdad also continued to host other Palestinian rejectionist groups including the Arab Liberation Front and the 15 May Organization." Iraq continued to support terrorism organizations.

2002, the "Patterns of Global Terrorism":

"Iraq planned and sponsored international terrorism in 2002. Throughout the year, the Iraqi Intelligence Services laid the groundwork for possible attacks against civilian and military targets in the United States and other Western countries. The Iraqi Intelligence Services reportedly instructed its agents in early 2001 that their main mission was to obtain information about the U.S. and Israeli targets. The IIS, Iraqi Intelligence Services, also threatened dissidents in the Near East and Europe and stole records and computer files detailing anti-regime activity. In December 2002, the press claimed Iraqi intelligence killed Walid al-Mayahi, a Shia Iraqi refugee in Lebanon and member of the Iraqi National Congress. Iraq was a safe haven, transit point, and operational base for groups and individuals who direct violence against the United States, Israel and other countries. Baghdad overtly assisted two categories of Iraqi-based terrorist organizations, Iranian dissidents devoted to toppling the Iranian government and a variety of Palestinian groups opposed to peace with Israel."

It goes on to list the groups that I have talked about before. Again, provided material assistance to the Palestinian terrorist groups that are in the forefront of the intifada.

"Saddam paid the families of Palestinian suicide bombers to encourage Palestinian terrorism, channeling \$25,000 since March through the ALF alone to families of suicide bombers in Gaza and the West Bank. Public testimonials by Palestinian civilians and officials and canceled checks captured by Israel in the West Bank verify the transfer of a considerable amount of Iraqi money."

The threat is real. Back a few weeks ago, I had the opportunity to be at a meeting where the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, Steve Cambone, spoke. I think he wrapped it up quite well, because I think if you go through this and later on when you take a look at what the Director of the CIA said, Mr. Tenet, who served in both the Clinton and the current Bush administrations, you go through and you take a look at everything or much of what was said during the 1990s by a number of officials within the Clinton

administration, what was said by the Bush administration, what was said earlier on in the 1990s by Senator Al Gore, outlining the threat to the United States. And then imagine taking a look at that threat through the window of 9/11. Here is what Mr. Cambone said:

"We are a nation at war. We do not know how long it will last, but it is unlikely to be short. We cannot know where or against whom all of its battles will be fought. There are multiple fronts in this war. There is no single theater of operation."

□ 1500

"We do know that we are all at risk, at home and abroad, civilians and military alike. We do know that battles and campaigns will be both conventional and unconventional in their conduct. Some of those battles and campaigns will be fought in the open, and others will be fought in secret, where our victories will be known to only a few."

Think back on the last few years and the attacks that we have been the victims of. We do know, as Dr. Cambone says again, that we are all at risk, at home and abroad. On 9/11, the attack on the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, the crash in the field in Pennsylvania, civilians were victims, civilians here in our homeland. But our embassies have been attacked in Africa. Our military folks have been attacked aboard the USS *Cole*. Our barracks have been attacked in Saudi Arabia and the World Trade Center was attacked in 1993. Dr. Cambone identified, "We do know that we are all at risk, at home and abroad, civilians and military alike," and we know now with the ongoing activities in Iraq that over 500 young men and women have lost their lives in Iraq. There have been countless numbers of our folks who have been wounded, many of them rather severely. I had the opportunity to meet with one of the families this week of someone who was badly injured in Iraq, and it was their prayer and their request that we, as Americans, not forget about those who have been injured in Iraq, that with these improvised explosive devices that are targeting our military vehicles or that suicide bombers with very deadly bombs, that there are other American families who are hurting. They are the ones whose loved ones are in a hospital in Iraq, in Germany or here in Washington, D.C. at Walter Reed Hospital. So let us not forget our military individuals who have been injured in and their families.

Dr. Cambone goes on to say "We are facing a turbulent and volatile world populated by a number of highly adaptive state and nonstate actors. Some of these are weighing whether, to what extent, or how, they might oppose the interests of the United States and its friends. Others, such as the terrorist organizations responsible for attacks on the United States, Turkey, Indonesia, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Israel,

Kenya, the Philippines, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, and other places have committed themselves to war."

I think that is what we have to recognize. This is what Dr. Cambone says. These individuals have committed themselves to war with the United States. Whether we want to be engaged in this war or not is no longer our decision. They have committed themselves and declared war on the United States. We now need to respond to protect and provide for the security of the United States.

"... It is impossible to predict with confidence what nation or entity will pose a threat, in 5, 10, or 20 years, to the United States or to our friends and allies."

Dr. Cambone goes on to say: "But not everything that unfolds in the coming years should be a surprise."

If we take a look at history the last 12, 13 years, what can we expect? He goes on: "We can expect that an adversary will continuously search for effective means to attack our people; our economy, military, and political power; and the people in power of our friends and allies."

"We can also expect that an adversary will have access to a range of modern technologies and will be prepared to use them to magnify the destructiveness of their attacks, using truck bombs and improvised explosives, cyber intrusions to attack the computer systems upon which we rely, radio transmitters to jam our space assets, small laboratories to develop new biological and genetically altered agents, and chemical and nuclear technology and materials delivered by missile, plane, boat, or backpack to poison our environment and destroy human lives."

"In this era of surprise, lack of preparation is a harbinger of catastrophe. Being prepared, by which I mean taking measures to avoid surprise, if possible to mitigate its effect when it occurs, and to bring appropriate force to bear to defeat those who would surprise us, is essential."

This is a very complicated and a very difficult environment in which we work today. We need to convince ourselves that there is a real threat to the United States. We need to educate ourselves as to what the threat looks like. It is very difficult to predict exactly what it is going to look like, and then to have the dialogue and the discussion as to how we respond. I think part of the problem that we have in 2004 is that the debate and the discussion that could have taken place 4 or 5 years ago never took place. Even though there was mounting evidence and even though the Clinton administration in many ways was trying to raise the profile of this issue, we did not have the national debate about how we respond to an emerging threat to the United States. We had that discussion and that debate and we understood the threat of the Cold War. I am not sure how long it took America and our al-

lies to come together to recognize the threat and to respond to the threat, but we did. America responded after World War II immediately recognizing the threat, helping to rebuild a free Europe, a democratic Europe, being the focal point for creating NATO to stand as the barrier to expansion of the former Soviet Union, and we did it incredibly well, and in many ways, as we describe the effort against the former Soviet Union, it kind of matches the threat that we face today. We knew there was a threat. We did not know exactly how it would manifest itself. We did not know exactly if there would ever be an attack against the United States. But we figured it would be a long and difficult struggle. There were no easy answers but that we would come together and that we would be engaged in what we called the Cold War. And the Cold War lasted 45 years. And then finally the wall came down and we were able to declare victory. But as that wall was coming down, another threat began to emerge, and that was the threat of terrorist organizations. So after 1945, it probably took us a period of time to identify the threat, to have the discussion and the dialogue within the country as to how we should respond to the threat, but once we identified the threat, once we had the national dialogue about the threat, there was a lot of consensus about how we should respond, and the response was one of we are going to be forceful and we are going to be in a position to defend ourselves and we are going to stand strong. And after 45 years we were able to defeat and win the Cold War. There are lessons that we can learn from that but we need to now go through the process.

Hopefully Americans, as they take a look at the events of the 1990s, as they then take a look at what happened on 9/11, and as they take a look at what is going on in Iraq and what we have found in Iraq, they will begin to understand the nature of the threat to the United States. A very uncomfortable threat. With the former Soviet Union and the Cold War, we could identify the buildings, we could identify the people, we could identify the borders and the boundaries most of the time. But here we do not know the players. We do not know their strength. We do not know where they are. But we do know a few things. We do know that they are very willing to use unconventional weapons in unconventional ways, that they will attack civilians and military personnel. They will attack our friends, they will attack us in places around the world in very deadly ways. We know that they come back and revisit their same targets on a regular basis until they are successful. So we know quite a bit about them.

Here is what Director Tenet of the CIA said, who is very familiar with this because he is the one person who was carried through as the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency from the Clinton administration through the

Bush administration, recognizing that the Clinton administration saw terrorism and Iraq as a threat and carried that message and that understanding into the Bush administration. What does he say in a speech that he gave on February 24? I would encourage my colleagues to read the speech in detail because it gives a lot of framework and context to the challenges that we face in 2004. As a matter of fact, it is entitled *The Worldwide Threat 2004: Challenges in a Changing Global Context*. What does he say about terrorism? "I'll begin today on terrorism, with a stark bottom line: The al Qaeda leadership structure we charted after September 11 is seriously damaged, but the group remains as committed as ever to attacking the U.S. homeland. But as we continue the battle against al Qaeda, we must overcome a movement, a global movement infected by al Qaeda's radical agenda. In this battle we are moving forward in our knowledge of the enemy, his plans, capabilities, and intentions. And what we've learned continues to validate my deepest concern: that this enemy remains intent on obtaining, and using, catastrophic weapons."

Going on: "Military and intelligence operations by the United States and its allies overseas have degraded the group. Local al Qaeda cells are forced to make their own decisions because of disarray in the central leadership."

"We are creating large and growing gaps in the al Qaeda hierarchy."

"And we are receiving a broad array of help from our coalition partners, who have been central to our effort against al Qaeda."

In a little while, I am going to talk about the changes in Libya. But the amazing thing is that more and more countries are coming to the realization that we are involved in a war on terrorism and that they are involved in a war on terrorism and that in many cases the terrorists do not distinguish between America or America and its friends.

Whom are we getting help from?

"Since the May 12 bombings, the Saudi government has shown an important commitment to fighting al Qaeda in the Kingdom, and Saudi officers have paid with their lives. Elsewhere in the Arab world we're receiving valuable cooperation from Jordan, Morocco, Egypt, Algeria, the UAE, Oman, and many others. President Musharraf of Pakistan remains a courageous and indispensable ally who has become the target of assassins for the help he's given us."

It is always interesting to hear people say we do not have any friends in this. We have got lots of friends in this whose countries are paying with the lives of their citizens and their security personnel.

□ 1515

Partners in Southeast Asia have been instrumental in the roundup of key regional associates of al Qaeda. Our European partners worked closely together to unravel and disrupt a continent-wide network of terrorists planning chemical, biological, and conventional attacks in Europe. So we have made notable strides. But do not misunderstand me, again quoting Director Tenet. Do not misunderstand me. I am not suggesting al Qaeda is defeated. It is not. We are still at war. This is a learning organization that remains committed to attacking the United States, its friends and allies.

Successive blows to al Qaeda's central leadership have transformed the organization into a loose collection of regional networks that operate more autonomously. These regional components have demonstrated their operational prowess in the past years. The sites of their attacks span the entire reach of al Qaeda: Morocco, Kenya, Turkey, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Indonesia. And al Qaeda seeks to influence the regional networks with operational training consultations and money. Khalid Sheik Mohamad sent Hambali \$50,000 for operations in Southeast Asia. You should not take the fact that these attacks occurred abroad to mean that the threat to the United States homeland has waned. As al Qaeda and its associated groups undertook these attacks overseas, detainees consistently talk about the importance the group still attaches to striking the main enemy, the United States.

Across the operational spectrum, air, maritime, special weapons, we have time and again uncovered plots that are chilling. On aircraft plots alone, we have uncovered new plans to recruit pilots and to evade new security measures in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Europe. Even catastrophic attacks on the scale of 11 September remain within al Qaeda's reach. Make no mistake, these plots are hatched abroad; but they target U.S. soil or that of our allies.

Remember, I am quoting from a speech that is available to all my colleagues on the Central Intelligence Agency Web page, and I encourage them to read this.

So far I have been talking only about al Qaeda, but al Qaeda is not the limit of terrorist threats worldwide. Al Qaeda has infected others with its ideology, which depicts the United States as Islam's greatest foe. The steady growth of Osama bin Laden's anti-U.S. sentiment through the wider Sunni extremist movement and the broad dissemination of al Qaeda's destructive expertise ensure that a serious threat will remain for the foreseeable future, with or without al Qaeda in the picture. If we take care of al Qaeda and capture bin Laden, it is not over. There is still a tremendous amount of work to do.

A decade ago, bin Laden had a vision of rousing Islamic terrorists worldwide

to attack the United States. He created al Qaeda to indoctrinate a worldwide movement and global jihad with America as the enemy, an enemy to be attacked with every means at hand. In the minds of bin Laden and his cohorts, September 11 was the shining moment, their shot heard round the world; and they want to capitalize on it. That was not the culmination; that was the kickoff of their campaign. And so even as al Qaeda reels from our blows, other extremist groups within the movement, it influences to become the next wave of the terrorist threat.

Let me just kind of summarize the terrorism and the threat that we face, quoting Mr. Tenet from his speech: "For the growing number of jihadists interested in attacking the United States, a spectacular attack on the U.S. homeland is the brass ring that many strive for, with or without the encouragement by al Qaeda's central leadership." A spectacular attack on the U.S. homeland is the brass ring that many strive for, with or without encouragement by al Qaeda's central leadership.

I want to talk a little bit about the rebuilding efforts that are going on in Iraq and Afghanistan. It was a couple of weeks ago that I and some of my colleagues had the opportunity to visit Iraq and to take a look at exactly what was happening. There is tremendous progress being made in Iraq, there is tremendous progress being made in Afghanistan, but I think we have to put this in the context of how much work actually has to happen.

Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq for over 30 years. There was no rule of law. There were no effective police agencies. There were no judicial processes in place. It was a mess.

If we go back and take a look at the rebuilding process, as Americans we should not underestimate the amount of work that needs to take place. In Iraq, Saddam Hussein ruled this country ruthlessly for 30 years, killing, executing somewhere in the neighborhood of 300,000 to 500,000 of his own people, brutally attacking the Shiites after the 1991 Gulf War, attacking the Kurds in the north of Iraq, breaking down the rule of law, breaking down a civil society, no police, no law enforcement, no judiciary, no transparent government, you know, totally destroying what we would call a civil society.

That is the same thing we see in Afghanistan after 12 years of rule by the Taliban or the Russians. Again, the rule of law is gone, no police, no effective security forces, no framework, and no rules by which society can live together in a civil way.

We are now trying to help the Iraqis and the people in Afghanistan to build a civil society, with a tremendous amount of focus on developing policing organizations, a law enforcement process, a judicial process, a constitution that will enable the folks in Iraq and Afghanistan to create a civil society. In both countries we are also working

on trying to help them rebuild infrastructure, roads, hospitals, schools, other health care facilities, make sure that they have got water and food, the basic necessities of life.

It is going to take tremendous amounts of time and energy for the people in these countries to identify the rules by which they want to live together, to then structure the security and the police and the law enforcement and the judicial branch to make it happen, to establish institutions of government that are transparent so that the people who are served by these government institutions actually recognize and believe that these government institutions are working for them, rather than being an organization that they should fear, that might imprison them.

They are experimenting with the opportunity of free speech, and in both countries they are beginning the process of constitutional and representative government by which they will have elections and have the individuals that they elect begin to govern them.

So it is a very, very difficult process that, at the same time, is being hindered by the continuing violence in both Iraq and Afghanistan. So as we try to help them rebuild a civil society, there is tremendous challenge that they face because of the violence.

There is a letter that we got the other day that was picked up in Iraq that outlined the strategy. Here is one of the terrorists talking about their strategy:

"After study and examination, we can narrow our enemy down to four groups. The Americans. These, as you know, are the most cowardly of God's creatures. They are an easy quarry, praise be to God. We ask God to enable us to kill them and capture them to sow panic among those behind them and to trade them for our detained Shiites and brothers.

"The Kurds. These are a lump in the throat and a thorn, whose time to be clipped is yet to come. They are last on the list, even though we are making efforts to harm some of their symbolic figures, God willing.

"Soldiers, police and agents. These are the eyes, ears and hands of the occupier through which he sees, hears and delivers violent blows. God willing, we are determined to target them strong in the coming period before the situation is consolidated and they control."

I will get on to the fourth in a minute. When we were in Iraq, we had the opportunity to go visit the police academy, 500, 600 young people who were committed to helping rebuild Iraq and rebuilding a civil society. They know that when they come out of their 4 to 6 weeks of training and they go on the streets of Baghdad, Basra and the other cities in Iraq, they walk out on their streets with a target on their back, because the last thing the terrorists want to see, of those opposed to us in Iraq, the last thing that they want to see is an effective law enforcement

and security apparatus in Iraq, because they know that that is the beginning of the end.

We went there, we laid a wreath in recognition of the over 100 police cadets, policemen and women and potential recruits who were killed in the 8 to 10 days before we came there through suicide bombings. We then had the opportunity to shake hands and to meet many of these recruits. Their enthusiasm for their work, their enthusiasm for building a new Iraq, their enthusiasm that Saddam Hussein was gone and that they had their country back was very, very clear. They knew that it was the Americans that had given them their country back; and they were very, very appreciative and thankful. They knew that the future of Iraq was in their hands, and not in the hands of the Americans or the coalition forces, but that what we provided them was the framework to take back their country and to move in the future.

You could see it in their eyes when you looked at them, you could feel it in the vigor and the strength of their handshake, you could hear it in their voices; and as you left, they took their hand and put it on their heart and moved it away to express the deepness and the sincerity in the comments that they were making to us.

The Shia, how do our terrorists feel about the Shia? These, in our opinion, are the key to change. I mean, the key to change? What kind of change are they looking for? I mean that targeting and hitting them in their religious, political and military depth will provoke them to show the Sunnis their rabies and bear the teeth of the hidden rancor hidden in their breast. If we succeed in dragging them into the arena of sectarian war, it will become possible to awaken the inattentive Sunnis as they feel imminent danger and annihilating death at the hands of these Sabians. Despite their weakness and fragmentation, the Sunnis are the sharpest blades, the most determined and most loyal when they meet those Batinies, who are a people of treachery and cowardice. They are arrogant only with the weak and attack only the broken wing. Most of the Sunnis are aware of the danger of these people, watch their sides and fear the consequences of empowering them. Were it not for the enfeebled Sufi sheiks and the Muslim brothers, people would have told a different tale.

It is very clear what the folks who are opposed to us are going to do. They are going to kill the police and they are going to fight and drive sectarian violence.

I want to talk just briefly about Libya, because some have said showing strength is a problem. Take a look at what has happened with the Libyans. I was there a couple of weeks ago as well. At the end of the December visit, the Libyans admitted having a nuclear weapons program and having bought uranium feed material for gas cen-

trifuge enrichment, admitted having nuclear weapons design documents, acknowledged having made about 25 tons of sulfur mustard chemical weapons agents, aerial bombs for the mustard and small amounts of nerve agent, provided access to their deployed Skud-B forces and revealed the details of indigenous missile design work and of cooperation with North Korea on the 800 kilometer range Scuds-CSs.

□ 1530

What a change in Libya. The headlines in today's paper. "Ghadafi Vows No More Terror." He seeks a new era with the United States, seeks better relationships with the United States.

One of our colleagues who was there this weekend is quoted as saying, "The incredible thing about being here is to hear a former antagonist of our country say, 'What in the world was I thinking when I took on a superpower,' says SILVESTRE REYES, Texas, Democrat. 'I thought it was an incredible, historic moment. This could potentially redefine our relationships with Africa and potential with the most conflicted part of the world, which is the Middle East. If I had not been here and had Chairman WELDON or Congressman ORTIZ tell me about it, I would not have believed it,' he said."

So what a dramatic change we are seeing, I think, in many reasons because we have displayed strength and the determination in dealing with the types of threats that President Clinton and his administration identified throughout the 1990s, that President Bush and his administration identified during their administration, and because of the strong action we are seeing a change in behavior in Libya, with a possibility and hope for progress in Iran and North Korea.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 3717, BROADCAST DECENCY ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2004

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. (during the Special Order of Mr. HOEKSTRA) Madam Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of March 8 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 3717, the Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2004. The Committee on Energy and Commerce ordered the bill reported yesterday, March 3, 2004, and is expected to file its report in the House on Tuesday, March 9, 2004.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in Room H-312 of the Capitol by 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 10.

Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bill as re-

ported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce which will be available tomorrow for their review on the Web sites of both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Rules.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format. Members are also advised to check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

VICE PRESIDENT CHENEY'S ABUSES OF POWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon to urge Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia to recuse himself from a case that the Supreme Court will hear this year regarding Vice President CHENEY.

I am also here this evening to voice my concern over another example of Vice President CHENEY abusing his power as Vice President to continue to keep secret documents that would significantly impact our Nation's future energy policy.

Madam Speaker, for 3 years now the Vice President has done everything he can to keep the record of his energy task force secret. This secret task force developed President Bush's energy policy, a policy that was then made into legislation here in Congress, legislation that is now stalled in the other body. Nevertheless, the end result of this task force and of that legislation was bad energy policy. There is no doubt that the energy industry succeeded with its influence during these secret closed door meetings in crafting an energy policy that benefited them rather than benefitting Americans who at the time desperately needed relief from high energy prices.

For 3 years now the Vice President has refused to let the American people know who made up this White House energy task force. For 3 years now the Vice President has refused to let the American people know how and why the task force came to the conclusions it did about energy policy. And finally, after 3 years of hiding the information, it appeared that we would finally get some of the information CHENEY was fighting so hard to keep secret, thanks to the Sierra Club and another conservative group called Judicial Watch who jointly sued the Vice President and the energy task force, seeking an accounting of energy participation in crafting the Bush administration's destructive energy policy.

There was a Federal district court order that said that the administration as a result of this suit had to provide information about participation from these industries, which the Bush administration refused to do. The Bush